DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 654 RC 012 741

AUTHOR Bryant, Clifton D.; And Others
TITLE Occupational Diversity of Rural Residents in Virginia: A Research Study of Multiple Job Holding and Labor Exchange. Virginia Higher Education Research Project No. 2034410.
INSTITUTION Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State Univ., Blacksburg.
SPONS AGENCY Virginia
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 93p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Satisfaction; Employed Women; *Employment Patterns; Handicrafts; Human Resources; *Job Satisfaction; *Multiple Employment; Occupational Surveys; Occupations; Part Time Employment; Questionnaires; Racial Differences; Rural Farm Residents; *Rural Nonfarm Residents; *Rural Population; Sex Differences; Socioeconomic Influences
IDENTIFIERS *Commuting Patterns; *Virginia

ABSTRACT

For a 1979 study of occupational division of labor in rural areas, in-depth interviews conducted with 541 randomly selected respondents from 4 Virginia counties examined socio-demographic parameters (age, sex, race, and occupation); degree of involvement in multiple job holding; economic and social-psychological motives for participation in multiple job structures; and the impact on the rural occupational structure. Data indicated a diversified occupational structure, with rural workers participating in relatively even numbers across all occupational categories. Farming was a secondary consideration of the rural dweller, who was more likely to travel great distances to work in a factory than to farm. There was a considerable emphasis on craft industries (including vehicle and equipment repair as well as traditional crafts) and some indication that crafts were becoming a major rural occupation or second occupation. Approximately one-third of the labor force held more than one job, either for extra income or to develop new creative and productive outlets. Job satisfaction among respondents was high, with little difference between males and females; whites appeared to be more satisfied with their jobs than non-whites. Most individuals were willing to commute to work so they could enjoy the advantages of living in a rural area. (CM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED202654

OCCUPATIONAL DIVERSITY OF RURAL RESIDENTS IN VIRGINIA: A RESEARCH STUDY OF MULTIPLE JOB HOLDING AND LABOR EXCHANGE

MAR 1981
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

VIRGINIA TECH

Department of Sociology

Clifton D. Bryant, Ph.D.

Charles J. Dudley, Ph.D.

Donald J. Shoemaker, Ph. D.

(in alphabetical order)

With the assistance of:

Daniel Dotter
Kenneth Perkins

156

Funded by State of Virginia

Appropriated Monies for

Higher Education Research

Project No. 2034410

RC 012741

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donald J. Shoemaker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the work and cooperation of several people. First, we would like to express our appreciation to the county agents whose support of the project was invaluable to its completion. The agents are as follows: Carter Fleming, Craig County; Edward Hanes, Cumberland County; William Edwards, Middlesex County; and W. R. Owings, Rappahannock County.

Next, we would like to recognize the following student assistants whose efforts in the field provided the basic data for this project: Dan Dotter, Cathy Hammond, Matt Kessler, Linda Koltuniak, Ken Perkins, Charles Vaught, and Jerry Warner. Dan Dotter and Ken Perkins also contributed to the data analysis and to the preparation of this report.

Finally, we would like to express our thanks to the residents of the four counties, without whose cooperation this study would never have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		ii
LIST OF TABLES		v
I.	The Study	1
	Introduction	1
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Research Design and Sample	3
II.	General Occupational Structure & Multiple Job Holdings	7
	Findings	8
	Conclusions	12
III.	The Profile of Job Satisfaction Among the Respondents	15
	Introduction	15
	Extent and Distribution of Job Satisfaction	15
	Findings	17
	Multiple Job Status	18
	Distance Traveled to Work & Intention to Leave Community	19
	Social Demographic Factors	20
	Summary	23
IV.	Travel to Work Relationships	31
	Introduction	31
	Findings	32
	Travel to Work by County and Intention to Leave	33
	Demographic Variations	34
	Socio-Economic Relationships	36
	Conclusions	38
V.	Occupational Skills	45
VI.	Imposition of Urban Occupational Patterns on Traditional Rural Life	54
	Introduction	54
	Findings	56
	1. The population of workers	56
	2. The desire to preserve rural life	60
VII.	Conclusions and Implications	65
	Social Change and the Division of Labor	65
	Multiple Job Holding & Attendent Occupational Structure	67
	Rural Work and Job Satisfaction	69
	Travel to Work	72
	Occupational Skills	73
	Urban Occupational Patterns & the Impact on Traditional Rural Life	74
	Epilog	75
REFERENCES		79
APPENDIX		81

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.1	*Frequency Distribution of Selected Demographic Charicteristics of the Total Sample and of the Sample within Each County*	6
2.1	*Major Occupation, Spouse Occupation, and Second Occupation of Respondent, for Residents of Four Rural Counties; Frequencies*	14
3.1	*The Distribution of Job Satisfaction - Total Sample*	25
3.2	*Job Satisfaction by County.*	25
3.3	*Job Satisfaction by Multiple Job Status of Respondents - Total Sample.*	25
3.4	*Job Satisfaction by Distance Travelled to Work - Total Sample.*	26
3.5	*Job Satisfaction by Intentions of Leaving the Community - Total Sample.*	26
3.6	*Job Satisfaction by Sex of Respondent - Total Sample.*	27
3.7	*Job Satisfaction by Race of Respondent - Total Sample*	27
3.8	*Job Satisfaction by Age of Respondent - Total Sample.*	28
3.9	*Job Satisfaction by Education of Respondent - Total Sample.*	28
3.10	*Job Satisfaction by Major Occupation of Respondent - Total Sample.*	29
3.11	*Job Satisfaction and Occupational Status Among Female Respondents*	30
4.1	*Frequency Distributions of Travel to Work Factors*	40
4.2	*Distance Travelled to Work by County.*	41
4.3	*Distance Travelled to Work by Intentions of Leaving the Community - Total Sample*	41
4.4	*Distance Travelled to Work by Sex of Respondent - Total Sample.*	42
4.5	*Distance Travelled to Work by Age of Respondent - Total Sample.*	42

The previous numbered page in the original document was blank

Table		Page
4.6	*Distance Travelled to Work by Race of Respondent - Total Sample.*	42
4.7	*Distance Travelled to Work by Marital Status of Respondent - Total Sample*	43
4.8	*Distance Travelled to Work by Education of Respondent - Total Sample.*	43
4.9	*Distance Travelled to Work by Major Occupation of Respondent - Total Sample*	44
5.1	*Distribution of Unused Occupational Skills by Major Occupational Categories in Four Virginia Counties*	51
5.2	*Distribution of Unused Occupational Skills by Sex*	52
5.3	*Distribution of Occupational Skills in Four Counties in Virginia.*	53
6.1	*Income Producing Jobs, Percent and Percent Change in Each Occupational Category, 1940 and 1970.*	62
6.2	*Occupational Distribution of Second Jobs.*	63
6.3	*Proportion of Income Producing Work Force that is Female, 1940 and 1970 by Occupational Category.*	64

CHAPTER I

THE STUDY

Introduction

In recent years a number of studies have focused on the changes occurring in the organization of American agricultural and rural labor structure (Coughenour and Kowalski, 1977; Ellis, 1975; Heffernan and Lasley, 1978). Like other parts of the country, the South has undergone two demographic transitions simultaneously: 1) the stablization in the number of farms and farm operations; and 2) a "counter-urbanization" phenomenon. The counter-urbanization movement of people has been masked by the real growth of cities (by growth related to fertility). When the real growth of urban areas is controlled for, a pattern of movement from metropolitan to non-metropolitan areas is evident. For the southeastern states, the future appears to portend population stabilization (or perhaps population growth) and, more importantly, new directions in rural development.

Much of the predicted development of rural areas will center around the change in the division of labor and occupational structure of the rural villages and communities. In the past two decades, the structure of agricultural production has changed from one of the smaller "family farms" to one of agri-business. As a result of these changes, community life, including the occupational structure of rural residents, has undergone considerable change. Of those families that attempted to maintain farms, almost 50 percent maintained full-time, off-farm jobs in 1974. Another 25 percent had reached retirement age (Orden, et al., 1979). Throughout the South, farms tend to be classified as small; over two-thirds have a gross annual income of less than $20,000. Part-time farming has become an integral part of southern rural life.

In addition, farmers with both full- and part-time off-farm employment are being joined by increasing numbers of rural, non-farm households. As a result, community life, occupational structure, and the distribution of goods and services in rural areas tends to become more like that of urban areas. The differences in rural and urban life decrease in the post-industrial society. The development of rural life in these directions is not a simple matter. From the demographic trends listed above, it can be hypothesized that rural residents (both farm and non-farm) are forced to depend on the income of more than one occupation. Further, it can be hypothesized that the multiple job structure of rural residents forms a unified system of exchange in the rural community. In short, given the generalized industrialization of the society, both the rural resident and the rural community develop more complex economic relationships.

Statement of the Problem

As rural America adopts the technology and the attitudes of a generally urban society, there is certain to be a lag time between knowledge and the inculcation of that knowledge into the everyday life of rural residents. While the technology is available, how is it serviced? That is to say, that with the adoption of an urban technology, how is a system of maintenance developed? At the most elemental level, how does one get a television repaired? How are the skills needed to operate new technologies learned? As the attitudes are accepted, do they affect such factors as job satisfaction and worker alienation, so endemic to the urban dweller? Does the sense of community, so central to the notion of rural life, change in such circumstances? The answer to these questions will require years of research. This project is a part of that process

in that it systematically examines the occupational structure of several counties that are among the most rural in Virginia.

Specifically, this study seeks to closely examine four questions relative to the occupational division of labor in the four counties. (1) What are the social and economic parameters, such as age, sex, race, and occupation, within which multiple job holding and informal labor exchange occur? (2) How many rural residents participate in a work and occupational structure that involves holding diverse jobs? This includes both multiple jobs held by the individual and by family members. (3) What are the social-psychological and/or economic motives for participation in multiple occupations? (4) What impact does this activity have on the rural community in terms of its occupational structure? Our primary purpose, then, is the description of the occupational structure of rural counties. Given its exploratory nature, no specific hypotheses are stated, but the general guiding hypothesis is that work specialization in rural counties is largely underestimated and that the interdependence of residents is overestimated.

Research Design and Sample

Respondents for this study were selected on the basis of a stratified random sampling design (Kish, 1965). Four counties were selected by the authors for inclusion in the study according to two major criteria: (1) a rural population, as defined by the absence of any municipality with a population of 2,500 or more and (2) regional representation, as defined by geographical location in or near one of several distinct sections of Virginia, including the centrally located "Piedmont" section (Cumberland County), the Chesapeake area (Middlesex County), the northern Shenandoah

Valley area (Rappahannock County), and the "boot" section of southwestern Virginia (Craig County).

The county extension agent in each county was then contacted concerning the nature of the study, the general characteristics and impressions of the people of the county, and the geographical distribution of homes and roads in the county. A visit by one of the project directors and one of six student interviewers was then arranged with each county agent. The purpose of this meeting was to meet the agent personally, to answer any questions about the project, and, generally, to garner support of the project from the agent and/or other county officials as determined by the agent. At this initial meeting, the agents were asked to have a prepared notice of the impending study published in the local newspaper one or two weeks in advance. Excellent cooperation with the researchers was received from the county agents and other county officials in all four counties.

During the initial visit with the county agents, county road maps were obtained and the county's residential dwellings were sectioned and numbered. The enumeration of residences involved a variety of procedures: (1) riding along county roads with the agent and recording his house count estimates as we went along; (2) riding along roads and house counting by actual sitings; (3) consulting county commissioned dwellings and business maps; and (4) consulting local post offices (where we were often just behind the census enumerators). The combined use of two or more of these techniques in each county yielded an approximation of housing units along each road of every county. These approximations were conveyed to the county agents and other officials and were further checked against available county population counts completed over the last few years. These

enumeration validity checks confirmed the accuracy of the dwelling counts and we proceeded with the sampling procedure.

The goal in each county was to interview the head of the household or his/her spouse in approximately 150 households in each county. Using six interviewers, this goal translated into approximately 25 interviews per interviewer per week. The specific questions asked of each respondent are found in the Appendix. The county road maps were sectioned into six parts such that the number of estimated dwellings in each area was approximately equal. The interviewers were instructed to scout out the roads in their area before interviewing to become familiar with the distribution of the dwellings and to report any large discrepancies between their house counts and the estimates provided. They were further instructed to randomly select a house on a road and to systematically select subsequent houses from the remainder on that road. Because of the number of dwellings in each county, the proportion guiding the systematic selection process varied from county to county from 1/12, to 1/20, to 1/13, to 1/10. If a "respondent" was not home, the interviewer was instructed to make one return visit. If there was a refusal or if no one was found at home after the second visit, the interviewer was instructed to alternately contact the next house down from or the first house previous to the rejected house and to proceed with the systematic selection from that point.

This procedure yielded a total of 541 respondents, subdivided by county as follows: Cumberland = 145; Middlesex = 146; Rappahannock = 139; and Craig = 111. A brief description of the total sample and of the sample within each county is presented in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1. Frequency Distribution of Selected Demographic Characteristics of the Total Sample and of the Sample within Each County (Frequencies in Parentheses).

	Total Sample 541	Cumberland 145	Middlesex 146	Rappahannock 139	Craig 111
Age					
Mean	46.88	48.88	47.49	46.83	43.56
Mode	30.00	44.00	30.00	41.00	30.00
Range	18-86	18-86	18-83	22-76	18-83
Education					
0-8 yrs.	23.84(129)	32.41(47)	17.12(25)	30.94(43)	12.61(14)
9-12 yrs.	51.20(277)	45.52(66)	54.11(79)	47.48(66)	59.46(66)
13-16 yrs.	19.04(103)	17.24(25)	21.92(32)	16.55(23)	20.72(23)
17 and higher yrs.	5.91(32)	4.83(7)	6.85(10)	5.04(7)	7.21(8)
Total	99.99	100.00	100.00	100.01	100.00
Sex					
Male	56.93(308)	56.55(82)	53.42(78)	59.71(83)	58.56(65)
Female	43.07(233)	43.45(63)	46.58(68)	40.29(56)	41.44(46)
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Race					
White	84.10(455)	73.10(106)	79.45(116)	88.49(123)	99.10(110)
Non-White	15.90(86)	26.90(39)	20.55(30)	11.51(16)	0.90(1)
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Marital Status					
Married	82.81(448)	82.07(119)	80.14(117)	84.17(117)	85.58(95)
Single	9.61(52)	8.96(13)	10.27(15)	11.51(16)	7.21(8)
Other	7.58(41)	8.96(13)	9.59(14)	4.32(6)	7.21(8)
Total	100.00	99.99	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chapter 2

GENERAL OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE AND MULTIPLE JOB HOLDINGS

This chapter focuses on two main issues. The first is the general occupational structure of the four rural counties in 1979 and a brief review of the change in rural occupational structure over the last forty years. The second, and most important, issue is that of multiple jobs (moonlighting) in rural areas. These issues are significant for several reasons. First, we have known for a number of years that significant changes have occurred in the occupational structure of the rural United States. As agriculture has become more mechanized, the number of people employed in agricultural occupations has declined. For the United States as a whole, the 1970 census found that fewer than 4 percent of the population was engaged in productive agricultural production. Additionally, the 1940-1970 censuses shows a significant migration from rural to urban areas. Our questions center around the meaning of these changes in terms of community life, including the completeness of the local division of labor and exchange system, the changing occupational participation of women and the importance of multiple job holdings of the rural residents.

The data include a distribution of the respondents by major occupation for the present analysis and the respondents' spouses by major occupation. In addition, distribution of the second occupation held by the respondents is presented. The guiding hypotheses of this analysis are that the rural occupational structure has continued to become more diversified and that a number of rural residents have been forced, given the changing nature of rural occupational life, to seek secondary employment.

Findings

An overall impression from the distribution of occupations in this study is that there is a misconception about the work life of rural residents. Unlike the popular myth of the pastoral life, rural residents lead an occupational life not unlike that of a busy metropolis. Respondents were distributed across the occupational categories in a relatively even distribution (Table 2.1). The largest number of respondents were in craft occupations (12%). The smallest number were in the category of farm labor (1%). Farmers comprised about 7% of the labor force, down from previous years. The same was true of the respondents' spouses, whose occupations were distributed fairly evenly across occupational categories.

When the occupational distribution of 1979 is compared with the census date of 1940, 1950, 1960, and 1970, there is a significant change in occupational structure over that period of time. In 1940, the occupational structure of the four counties in this study was a monolithic one. That is to say, a preponderance of workers (over 50%) was directly involved in agricultural work. The rest of the workers were distributed across the other occupations. Over the years, the percentage of farmers has constantly decreased, while the percentage of workers in some occupational categories has increased even though there was a general decrease in the population in each of the counties over the same years.

The occupational structure of the rural areas has thus become more urban in nature. That is to say, the distribution across occupational categories has changed from one in which one occupation predominates to

one in which there is an equal, or nearly equal, number of people in each category. Another interesting finding is that the farm laborer (the hired hand, if you will) has virtually disappeared in its traditional form. In the 1940's a significant proportion of the labor force was involved in farm labor on a more or less permanent basis. Over the years, the number of farm laborers has been reduced significantly. The largest reduction has occurred since 1960. Farm laborers have largely been replaced by machines, with occasional use of migrant labor.

The occupational category with the largest number of people is craft occupations. One type of craft mentioned by many of the respondents involves an industrial craft system. By far the most frequent response in this category was the automobile mechanic or the equipment repair person. A second type of craft occupation often mentioned included the more traditional crafts, such as quilting, painting, writing, and making and refinishing furniture. Guns and other types of hunting equipment also provided craft occupations. One respondent, for example, was a knife maker. Over the last several decades, then, craft occupations have replaced agriculture as the occupation with the largest number of workers and it is possible that the craft occupations, particularly the traditional ones, will become a major industry in rural areas.

Additional examination of the occupational categories yields one more important observation concerning work in rural areas. The occupation of housewife remains more important to rural life than urban life. In the country in general, women comprise about 46-48% of the work force. In the four counties included in this study, women comprise only 40% of the labor force. Among our respondents, housewife was listed as the

major occupation of females. Thus, despite the fact that the rural occupational structure is becoming more urban in its structure, there is a lag in the number of women entering the labor force outside the home. One reason this is true is that there is no retirement system for housewives and many retired female respondents are included in the housewife category for the total sample.

Our second set of findings concern the multiple jobs of a single respondent. We found moonlighting to be much greater than expected in rural areas. In our four-county sample, 30 percent of the respondents held more than one job (Table 2.1). When one removes from consideration the number of retired and disabled (over 16 percent of our sample) then the percentage of the work force having more than one income-producing job is 33 percent - 1/3 of the labor force. Work life in rural areas appears to be considerably more hectic than one might have anticipated. There are a number of observations that can be made when we examine the multiple jobs of the respondents in the same census occupational categories.

The first point that we should make concerns the effort to determine the division of labor using census data. Most efforts to measure the division of labor attempt to measure the distribution of people across occupational or industrial categories. In the census data, each person is assigned one occupation. This will result, if our data on multiple jobs are to be accepted, in a significant underestimation of the specialization in the society and some overestimation of the level of interdependence. In rural areas, the system of production and exchange of goods and services is augmented significantly by the workers "fitting into" more than one place in the labor force. If data from urban areas

reveal a similar pattern (and we believe that they would) then current measures of the division of labor are insufficient.

The second observation concerns the craft occupations. As noted above, the craft occupations provide the major occupation for 12% of the respondents. Of the 154 workers who have two or more jobs, 39 (25%) of those jobs are in the craft category. Earlier we noted that the craft industry appears to be of increasing importance to the rural area. The fact that a significant part of the moonlighting involves craft occupations tends to support that argument.

A third observation concerning multiple occupations is that farming is largely a second job. In the four counties, 26 people (17% of those with more than one job) report that they farm on a part-time basis. There were college professors, newspaper columnists, and state troopers (among others) who maintained a farm. It is interesting to note that the ability of these people to continue farming as an occupation is dependent in part on the mechanization of farm production. The same factor that reduced the need for farmers and farm laborers allows the worker who is primarily engaged in another occupation to maintain farming as a second source of income. Farming as a second job allows the rural community to maintain an agrarian ambience, even if it will not provide a sufficient income to support the families of the modern "gentleman farmer."

Finally, we must comment on the fact that all occupational categories are represented in the second jobs of the respondents. Eight percent moonlight in professional occupations (nurses, teachers). Five percent work as part-time or seasonal salespersons, 15% moonlight as truck drivers and heavy equipment operators. It is significant to note that only two

respondents listed farm laborer as a second job - by far the smallest number in any occupational category.

Moonlighting is important to the rural community in two major ways. First, it provides income for rural residents that allows them to maintain themselves and their families. Second, it provides a chance for them to actually improve their lifestyle. More important than this, however, is the fact that the multiple jobs of rural residents are essential for the development of a complete system of exchange. Because of the limited population in rural areas, many of the goods and services available in industrial society simply cannot provide a full-time occupation for a worker in the rural setting. Workers providing such goods and services perform the task of making the more urban occupational structure found in the rural areas a complete one. Thus, the lifestyle of the rural resident in enhanced by the existence of a relatively complete exchange system.

Conclusions

Our view of the occupational structure and work-a-day world is considerably different than the traditional view of rural life. What we have found is a diversified occupational structure, with rural workers participating in relatively even numbers across all occupational categories. Further, we found that a large number (33%) of rural workers engaged in more than one income-producing occupation. Farming has become a secondary consideration of the rural dweller, who is more likely to travel great distances to work in a factory than to farm. We found a considerably emphasis on the craft industries in rural areas, and some signs that this is becoming a major rural occupation. Examination of

census data for the past forty years reveals that the nature of rural life has been undergoing considerable change. Based on our study, we expect the 1980 census to reveal not only the continued disappearance of traditional rural life, but to provide a clearer indication of the future of rural life. Our concern in the recent past has been the decline of agriculture as the occupational base of rural areas. This study gives a preliminary picture of the manner in which rural communities will move into the latter part of this century as a part of the post-industrial society.

Finally, our basic impression of the rural work life is one of fast-paced, almost hectic, activity. For those of nostalgic persuasion who might search for reassurance of bucolic existence in the agrarian context, disappointment is in store. The idyllic vista of pastoral quietude, agricultural routine, and rustic contentment, is missing its leading character. The rocking chair on the shaded porch is empty. Its occupant is away from the old homestead, commuting miles away to pursue alien vocations and hold down multiple jobs. The man from American Gothic, has in effect, joined the rural rat-race.

Table 2.1. Major Occupation, Spouse Occupation, and Second Occupation of Respondent, for Residents of Four Rural Counties; Frequencies (Percent).

	Major Occupation	Spouse Occupation	Second Occupation of Respondent
	541	541	156 (28.9)
Profession	43 (07.9)	34 (6.3)	13 (8.0)
Manager	33 (06.1)	25 (4.6)	5 (3.0)
Sales	26 (04.8)	17 (3.1)	8 (5.0)
Clerical	30 (05.5)	25 (4.6)	6 (4.0)
Craft	62 (11.5)	56 (10.4)	39 (25.0)
Operative	32 (05.9)	32 (5.9)	13 (8.0)
Transport	11 (02.0)	10 (1.9)	11 (7.0)
Labor	31 (05.7)	21 (3.9)	12 (8.0)
Farmer	42 (07.8)	17 (3.1)	26 (17.0)
Farm Labor	7 (01.3)	1 (0.2)	2 (0.4)
Service	28 (05.2)	26 (4.8)	13 (8.0)
Private	116 (21.4)	26 (4.8)	8 (5.0)
N/R, Retired Disabled	78 (14.5)	250 (46.7)	

CHAPTER 3

THE PROFILE OF JOB SATISFACTION AMONG THE RESPONDENTS

Introduction

An important component of the economic vitality and growth of a community or area is the degree to which the members of the community are satisfied with their jobs. Students of the subject have noted that job satisfaction or dissatisfaction may be related to several facets of life: (1) the individual worker's physical and emotional health and participation in community affairs; (2) the worker's amount and quality of productivity, including not only increased or decreased productivity, but also worker alienation and "industrial" sabotage; and (3) general societal effects, such as increased antisocial behavior, unemployment and economic inflation (U.S. Department of Labor, 1974: 19-28).

The importance of job satisfaction is also demonstrated by the number of studies conducted on worker satisfaction levels over the past several decades. These studies include thorough, systematic investigations by research institutes at major universities in the United States as well as numerous surveys of the U.S. population by the Gallup Polls.

Extent and Distribution of Job Satisfaction in National Studies

The results of these studies support that most American workers are satisfied with their jobs but that this proportion has fluctuated over the years. For example, the Gallup surveys indicated that 67% of those surveyed in 1949 were satisfied with their jobs while over 80%

of those surveyed in the decade of the sixties were satisfied with their jobs. The proportion of satisfied workers in the seventies, however, declined somewhat from the previous decade to between 75% and 80% by the mid-seventies (Gallup Opinion Index, 1973:8-9).

Both the Gallup surveys and the research institute investigations indicate that the amount of job satisfaction varied with the worker's social and economic status in society. Job satisfaction is reportedly higher among professional and white-collar workers as opposed to blue-collar and service employees. Those with a college degree express the highest levels of job satisfaction while those with some high school education, or a high school degree, or some college education report the lowest levels of job satisfaction. In general, job satisfaction is directly related to age (strongly) and to income. Also, surveys have consistently shown that whites are more satisfied with their jobs than non-whites. Interestingly, however, job satisfaction is not related to one's sex, with the exception that women workers with pre-school children are less satisfied with their jobs than other women workers or male workers (Gallup Opinion Index, 1973:12-33; U.S. Department of Labor, 1974:1-13; 54-56).

These studies of job satisfaction, however, have all been conducted in urban settings or have made no distinction between urban and rural areas. The analysis of job satisfaction in rural areas not only addresses an important element of social and economic growth but also presents an expanded account of an urban-focused subject. Because this project was a survey and because we wished to describe our findings in comparison with national data, the measure of job satisfaction used

in this study is comparable to that used in the national studies discussed earlier, the question was worded as follows: "Considering everything, how satisfied are you with this job?" The response options were very satisfied, satisfied, neither too satisfied nor too dissatisfied, dissatisfied, and very dissatisfied. The question, furthermore, was asked in relation to the respondent's major occupation.

Findings

The amount of job satisfaction among the total sample was quite high. Over 42 percent of the respondents said that they were very satisfied with their job and another 42 percent indicated they were satisfied with their job. On the other hand, only 2.5 percent were very dissatisfied with their job (Table 3.1). These figures compare closely to the national estimates of job satisfaction in recent years. In 1973, for example, the Gallup surveys reported that 48 percent of those interviewed were "very satisfied" with their job (Gallup Opinion Index, 1973:12). During the same year, several other national surveys indicated that around 90 percent of American workers were satisfied with their jobs (U.S. Department of Labor, 1974:4-5).

It would appear from the outset, therefore, that American workers, both urban and rural, are overwhelmingly satisfied with their jobs. This interpretation, however, is subject to the type of question asked. For example, the proportion of "dissatisfied" workers climbs to nearly half the sample when the question is worded in terms of intense interest in the job or in terms of willingness to move to another available job (U.S. Department of Labor, 1974:51).

To use the wording adapted in this study, therefore, tends to overestimate job satisfaction and to underestimate job dissatisfaction. It would thus seem particularly beneficial to note elements of job dissatisfaction as they emerge from the data, since those who indicate dissatisfaction with their job on this measure are most probably expressing firm attitudes.

Since the design of this survey included four distinct counties, the amount of job satisfaction was compared across counties. The results of this comparison are presented in Table 3.2. These data indicate that the overall distribution of job satisfaction is statistically even among the four counties. Because of space limitations and because the overall relationship between counties and job satisfaction was negligible, the rest of the discussion in this chapter will pertain to the total sample. Data on the distribution of job satisfaction, as presented below, have been generated for each of the four counties and are available upon request.

Multiple-Job Status

Since a major focus of this study is on the multiple-job structure in rural counties an obvious question emerges concerning the relationship between job satisfaction and multiple-job status. This relationship is summarized in Table 3.3. The figures presented indicate that multiple-job holders are no more nor no less satisfied with their major occupation than single job holders. It may be argued from this finding that multiple-job holding could be rather productive for a county inasmuch as multiple jobs can obviously contribute to the

economic vitality of a community while at the same time not detracting from the work satisfaction of those so employed. These data, however, do not reveal the effects of several different jobs on job satisfaction, nor do they specify combinations of particular kinds of multiple and secondary jobs on satisfaction. Thus, inferences should be cautiously developed at this point of analysis.

Distance Travelled to Work and Intention to Leave the Community

An important factor in American life today is the cost of transportation. This cost is obviously a critical aspect of the work structure of a community, as well as the employment situation of individuals. As such, the subject of travel to work patterns is treated separately in this report.

It might also be reasoned, however, that travel to work costs are related to one's level of job satisfaction. As one indication of travel to work expenditures, the respondents were asked to indicate the number of miles they travelled to work. The relationship between job satisfaction and distance travelled is presented in Table 3.4. Interestingly, these data fail to confirm our expectations. Among this sample, there is no statistical relationship between job satisfaction and distance travelled to work. The lack of a relationship between these two variables may well reflect a relatively indifferent or perhaps stoic, attitude on the part of rural residents towards the distance and cost factors associated with work. This attitude may derive from a history of migratory work patterns in rural areas, whereby rural workers who left the farm have had to at least

consider work outside of their home communities, often at considerable distances. It is interesting to speculate whether the absence of a relationship between job satisfaction and distance travelled to work in rural areas will persist in the face of rising energy costs and increased pressures to conserve fuel.

Apart from the theme of travel to work patterns, there is some evidence which indicates that, on a national scale, those who are satisfied with their job are also satisfied with other aspects of their lives, such as their future, their housing, their children's education, and their overall quality of life (Gallup Opinion Index, 1973:25). An indication of these attitudes towards one's current and future prospects in life is reflected in whether or not a person plans to leave the community. This question was asked of the respondents. The relationship between job satisfaction and intentions to leave is shown in Table 3.5. In accordance with evidence from national surveys there exists a strong relationship between job satisfaction and intentions to leave. This relationship is particularly noteworthy among the very satisfied segment of the sample, where the difference between those not planning to leave and those planning to leave is greater than 2 to 1. Of course, these data do not allow for any cause and effect interpretations, but it would seem evident from these data that job satisfaction is a key factor in keeping people in the community.

Socio-Demographic Factors

The data in this section indicate how job satisfaction is distributed according to the social and occupational positions of the respondents. The results would be helpful in pinpointing among what easily identifiable segment(s) of the population efforts at increasing job satisfaction might be most productive.

The first variables to be considered in this analysis are sex and race of respondents, presented in Tables 3.6 and 3.7. These data are in general agreement with national studies. That is, males and females are roughly equally satisfied with their jobs and whites are somewhat more satisfied with their jobs than nonwhites. It would seem, therefore, that there is nothing particular about the racial and sexual status structures of rural areas, compared with urban areas, which would have an impact on levels of job satisfaction.

Two other social factors which have been found to be associated with job satisfaction nationally are age and education. The relationships between these two factors and job satisfaction in our rural sample are presented in Tables 3.8 and 3.9. As with other surveys, these data indicate levels of job satisfaction increase with increased age and that those dissatisfied with their job are the young workers, particularly those between 17 and 25. Also consistent with national data, the results herein show that those with higher levels of education are more satisfied with their job than others. The relationship is not particularly strong, however, and presents some interesting anomalies. For instance, while those with more than a college degree represent the highest percentage of very satisfied workers, they also have the highest percentage of very dissatisfied workers. Perhaps this situation arises from a general distaste of rural life among some of the highly educated, who prefer the pace and cultural atmosphere of urban areas and who consider their jobs as the main reason they are living in rural areas.

Be that as it may, the implications of these findings on age, education and job satisfaction clearly point to the young employee, particularly the relatively undereducated young worker, as the type of individual who might benefit most from efforts aimed at increasing job satisfaction.

A final aspect of job satisfaction to be considered in this chapter concerns occupational distributions. First, job satisfaction is analyzed relative to type of occupation. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 3.10. Overall, the data reveal that no statistically significant relationship exists between job satisfaction and type of occupation. Because the number of occupational types included is so large, however, large differences in ranges of job satisfaction among some occupational categories tend to be obscure. For example, managers and administrators, both farm and nonfarm, and sales workers are approximately twice as very satisfied with their jobs as transport operatives and service workers, and about four times as very satisfied with their jobs as farm laborers and foremen. Overall, it would appear as if those in the lower-middle categories of occupational rank, such as sales workers, have the highest levels of job satisfaction relative to amounts of job dissatisfaction. In fact, as with the highly-educated respondents, those in professional occupations indicate a rather high proportionate level of job dissatisfaction, although the sample size in these categories is quite small.

In general, however, our data fail to support the national picture of job satisfaction as being directly related to occupational rank. Overall we find no statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and type of occupation. In addition, specific occupational comparisons suggest that those in sales work simultaneously express the highest amounts of job satisfaction and the lowest levels of job dissatisfaction.

Earlier, the relationship between job satisfaction and sex of respondent was presented and found to be nonsignificant. In consideration of the increasing participation of women in America's work force and in

view of evidence (including that from the present analysis, Table 3.10), that service and domestic work are associated with low levels of job satisfaction, it was thought desirable to compare job satisfaction among the women in the sample. The comparison presented in Table 3.11 looks at "working women" versus housewives (nearly half the female sample). Quite interestingly, no significant differences are found in this comparison. If anything, housewives are slightly more satisfied with their work than women working outside the home. Rural women, in other words, have not apparently decided that happiness is to be found in work outside the home. It may be that rural women view work more as an economic necessity than as a personality development mechanism. Whatever the reason may be for taking a job, however, it is the case that the women in this study are just as satisfied to work at home as to work outside the home and this would seem to contradict the image of the urban woman, who is seen as expanding her role in life more and more to include work and activities outside the home.

Summary

The data on job satisfaction conform to a general trend emerging from other aspects of this data. In many ways these rural residents are quite similar to urban dwellers. Overall, they are quite satisfied with their jobs and the distribution of job satisfaction across various socio-demographic categories is consistent with the patterns found in national studies.

These distributions indicate that while the overall level of job satisfaction is very high in all four counties, there are certain segments of the population which would stand to benefit from efforts to increase job satisfaction. Most notable among these are the young, the undereducated, and domestic or service employees.

At this time, it would appear that female workers are not in a disproportionate state of job satisfaction, compared to males, whether the women are working outside the home or in household activities. This finding, and the finding that sales workers appear to be somewhat more satisfied and less dissatisfied with their jobs than professional or managerial workers, suggest that significant differences remain between rural and urban dwellers in the occupational structure. Rural residents are perhaps closer to their urban counterparts than in prior times, but the rural-urban "merge" is far from complete at this time.

Table 3.1. The Distribution of Job Satisfaction - Total Sample.

	N	Percent
Very Satisfied	217	42.5
Satisfied	213	41.8
Neither	51	10.0
Dissatisfied	16	3.1
Very Dissatisfied	13	2.5
Totals	510	99.9

Table 3.2 Job Satisfaction by County (in Percents).

Job Satisfaction	County				
	Cumberland	Middlesex	Rappahannock	Craig	N
Very Satisfied	38.4	43.0	46.3	42.1	217
Satisfied	40.0	44.4	41.9	40.2	213
Neither	12.0	8.5	8.1	12.1	51
Dissatisfied	5.6	3.5	1.5	1.9	16
Very Dissatisfied	4.0	0.7	2.2	3.7	13
Total	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	
N	125	142	136	107	510

X^2 = 11.01, 12 d.f., n.s.

Table 3.3. Job Satisfaction by Multiple Job Status of Respondents - Total Sample (in Percents).

Job Satisfaction	Multiple Job Status		
	Yes	No	N
Very Satisfied	45.5	41.2	215
Satisfied	42.1	42.0	213
Neither	6.2	11.6	51
Dissatisfied	3.4	2.8	15
Very Dissatisfied	2.8	2.5	13
Total	100.0	100.1	
N	145	362	507

X^2 = 3.65, 4 d.f., n.s.

Table 3.4. Job Satisfaction by Distance Travelled to Work - Total Sample (in Percents).

Job Satisfaction	Distance to Work (round-trip miles)			
	Less than 10	11-20	22 and Over	N
Very Satisfied	44.3	34.0	39.2	168
Satisfied	42.7	44.7	43.3	177
Neither	8.3	8.5	12.3	41
Dissatisfied	3.1	10.6	2.9	16
Very Dissatisfied	1.6	2.1	2.3	8
Total	100.0	99.9	100.0	
N	192	47	171	410

Table 3.5. Job Satisfaction by Intentions of Leaving the Community - Total Sample (in Percents)

Job Satisfaction	Intentions to Leave		
	Yes	No	N
Very Satisfied	20.5	42.1	143
Satisfied	48.7	43.6	159
Neither	15.4	8.7	34
Dissatisfied	12.8	3.4	16
Very Dissatisfied	2.6	2.2	8
Total	100.0	100.0	
N	39	321	360

$X^2 = 12.83$, 4 d.f., p .01

Table 3.6. Job Satisfaction by Sex of Respondent - Total Sample (in Percent).

Job Satisfaction	Sex		
	Male	Female	N
Very Satisfied	47.0	36.8	217
Satisfied	38.0	46.6	213
Neither	9.4	10.8	51
Dissatisfied	3.5	2.7	16
Very Dissatisfied	2.1	3.1	13
Total	100.0	100.0	
N	287	223	510

$x^2 = 6.38$, 4 d.f., n.s.

Table 3.7. Job Satisfaction by Race of Respondent - Total Sample (in Percents).

Job Satisfaction	Race		
	White	Nonwhite	N
Very Satisfied	44.9	29.7	217
Satisfied	41.5	43.2	212
Neither	8.8	17.6	51
Dissatisfied	2.8	5.4	16
Very Dissatisfied	2.1	4.1	12
Total	100.1	100.0	
N	434	74	508

$x^2 = 10.81$, 4 d.f., $p > .03$

Table 3.8. Job Satisfaction by Age of Respondent - Total Sample (in Percents).

Job Satisfaction	Age						
	17-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-65	66+	N
Very Satisfied	24.1	43.4	41.9	41.2	46.8	52.0	217
Satisfied	38.9	38.4	47.9	49.4	36.7	36.0	213
Neither	24.1	14.1	5.1	7.1	11.4	4.0	51
Dissatisfied	11.1	3.0	1.7	0.0	1.3	5.3	16
Very Dissatisfied	1.9	1.0	3.4	2.4	3.8	2.7	13
Total	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	
N	54	99	117	85	79	75	510

x^2 = 48.40, 24 d.f., p < .002
Gamma = -.15

Table 3.9. Job Satisfaction by Education of Respondent - Total Sample (in Percents).

Job Satisfaction	Education (in years)				
	0-8	9-12	13-16	17+	N
Very Satisfied	39.8	38.2	53.7	56.7	217
Satisfied	45.1	44.5	34.7	26.7	213
Neither	7.1	12.5	8.4	3.3	51
Dissatisfied	4.4	3.3	1.1	3.3	16
Very Dissatisfied	3.5	1.5	2.1	10.0	13
Total	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	
N	113	272	95	30	510

x^2 = 23.57, 12 d.f., p < .02
Gamma = -.13

Table 3.10. Job Satisfaction by Major Occupation of Respondent - Total Sample (in Percents).

Job Satisfaction	Major Occupation					
	Prof., Tech., Kindred	Managers, Adm., Except Farm	Sales	Clerical and Kindred	Craftsmen and Kindred	Operatives, Except Transport
Very Satisfied	48.8	57.6	57.7	41.4	48.4	31.3
Satisfied	37.2	30.3	30.8	48.3	38.7	46.9
Neither	7.0	6.1	11.5	6.9	8.1	18.8
Dissatisfied	2.3	6.1	0.0	0.0	3.2	3.1
Very Dissatisfied	4.7	0.0	0.0	3.4	1.6	0.0
Total	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1
N	43	33	26	29	62	32

Table 3.10 Continued. Job Satisfaction by Major Occupation of Respondent - Total Sample (in Percents).

Job Satisfaction	Transport Operatives	Laborers, Except Farm	Farmers, Farm Managers	Farm Laborers, Foremen	Service Workers Except Private Household	Private Household (includes housewives)	N
Very Satisfied	27.3	45.2	52.4	14.3	25.9	37.7	197
Satisfied	54.4	35.5	42.9	57.1	51.9	43.9	190
Neither	9.1	19.4	2.4	28.6	11.1	12.3	48
Dissatisfied	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	3.5	13
Very Dissatisfied	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	3.7	2.6	9
Total	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	
N	11	31	42	7	27	114	457

χ^2 = 40.33, 44 d.f., n.s.

Table 3.11. Job Satisfaction and Occupational Status Among Female Respondents (in Percents).

Job Satisfaction	Occupational Status		
	Working Women	Housewives	N
Very Satisfied	34.7	39.0	82
Satisfied	49.2	43.8	104
Neither	8.5	13.3	24
Dissatisfied	2.5	2.9	6
Very Dissatisfied	5.1	1.0	7
Total	100.0	100.0	
N	118	105	223

$x^2 = 4.88$, 4 d.f., n.s.

Chapter 4

TRAVEL TO WORK RELATIONSHIPS

Introduction

With inflation and energy-shortage concerns occupying much of the public's attention at this time, the travel mode and costs associated with jobs and occupations is becoming an increasingly important aspect of the occupational structure of any locality. Research on travel to work patterns has typically involved the travel of urban employees (Guest, 1975, 1976; Bryant, et al., 1980). However, some research has recently been conducted which questions the generalizability of urban travel to work investigations to rural areas (Clemente and Summers, 1975). It would appear from these developments that travel to work studies conducted in rural communities will need to establish theoretical and empirical bases separate from those of urban investigations.

With these concerns in mind, the questionnaire for the present study contained a section dealing with a number of factors relating to travel to work. Specifically, each respondent was asked to indicate: (1) where his major occupation was located, that is, inside or outside his community of residence; (2) the estimated distance travelled to work (one-way); (3) the mode or method of transportation used to get to work; and (4) the estimated time it took to get to work (one-way). Since this study included the occupational situation of families, these same items were asked of each respondent in relationship to his/her spouse and children living in the household.

Findings

A. Frequency Distributions

Because previous research on travel to work configurations has yielded little information on rural patterns and because rural-based research has failed to support urban-based conclusions, hypotheses regarding rural configurations are premature. Consequently, the report in this chapter will be descriptive and exploratory. The first finding to be reported concerns the frequency distributions of the four travel to work variables identified above, as presented in Table 4.1. The results depicted in this table, and all other tables in this chapter, will be confined only to the respondents in the sample.

The data in Table 4.1 indicate that, on the average, the respondents in this sample work close to home, travelling one to three miles to work in one to five minutes. Additionally, the members of our sample get to work by essentially private means, largely by private car but also by walking. Very few of these residents use public transportation arrangements, or group techniques, such as carpooling, to get to work.

These results do not clearly reflect the intentions or wishes of the respondents. For sure, public transportation facilities are not used by rural residents because such means of transportation are rarely available. Similarly, carpooling may not be attractive to rural citizens, not because they dislike their neighbors or co-workers (theory and research on rural communities would suggest just the opposite), but because distances between homes or work schedules are too disparate to be economically feasible or otherwise convenient. In this regard, the researchers and interviewers noticed several instances of what appeared to be "car

stations" along major highway routes in the counties. Several cars would be parked alongside the road in one location for the course of a full day. Obviously, some workers had devised a car-pooling plan that, on the surface, would appear to offset some of the difficulties that car-pooling might present in rural areas.

It is interesting to note at this point that a recent survey in Richmond, Virginia included a description of the method of travel to work for Richmond residents (Sen and Benjamin, 1979). The results of this survey indicated that lower-income residents utilized a wider range of transportation methods to get to work than did middle-income residents (nearly 80 percent of whom drove their car to work). The various transportation devices utilized by lower-income residents included such things as buses, taxis, car-pooling, and walking (p. 27). When asked what method of transportation they would prefer to use, for a variety of purposes, lower-income residents again selected a wider range of options (to the private automobile) than those of middle-income salaries (pp. 29-30). Since far fewer low-income residents have access to private cars than middle-income dwellers (p. 26), it would seem plausible that, for Richmond residents, both actual and preferred choice of transportation to work, and for other purposes, is somewhat influenced by the availability of certain methods of conveyance. This same logic would, of course, extend to the transportation behavior and preferences of rural citizens as well.

B. Travel to Work by County and Intentions to Leave

Because of space limitations, the focus of the rest of this chapter will be on the factor of distance travelled to work. The further intent of this section is to discuss the variable of distance travelled to work as it is distributed throughout several segments of the sample.

The first analysis in this section concerns the relationship between distance travelled to work and county of residence. As the data in Table 4.2 reveal, there is a strong association between county and distance travelled. The strength of this relationship appears to lie in the relatively low percentage of residents in Craig County who travel over 40 miles to work (one-way) and the relatively high number of Craig County residents who travel between 16 and 40 miles to work. Other differences among the counties also appear in Table 4.2, but these figures for Craig County appear to be the most divergent from the rest of the sample. A detailed explanation for these results is beyond the scope of this study. It should be mentioned, however, that Craig County is nonindustralized and is located near Roanoke, Virginia. Undoubtedly, these factors are at least partly responsible for the relatively few workers in Craig County who work less than 16 miles from home and the relatively small percentage of workers who travel more than 40 miles to work.

Related to the previous discussion is the question of whether or not distance travelled to work is associated with intentions of leaving the community of residence. This relationship is displayed in Table 4.3. The figures convincingly demonstrate that a person's intentions of leaving (or staying) in his/her community of residence is <u>not</u> related to the distance he must travel to get to work each day. The future population of the counties surveyed would thus not appear to depend on distances travelled to work for their residents.

C. <u>Demographic Variations</u>

Up to now, the subjects of this chapter have either been all the respondents in the total sample or all of the respondents in each county.

The rest of the discussion in this chapter will focus on the individual characteristics of the respondents and how these relate to distance travelled to work. These individual characteristics will be divided into two sets: demographic and socio-economic. Demographic factors include the sex, age, race, and marital status of the respondents. Socio-economic factors involve the formal education and occupation of the respondents.

The relationship between sex and distance travelled to work is very interesting. There is a significant association between these two variables and the significance results largely from the fact that females stay close to home for their work while males travel greater distances to work (Table 4.4). Separate analysis of this relationship (Bryant et al., 1980) indicates that the relationship exists even when housewives are excluded from the analysis. This additional analysis also reveals that the very significant relationship between sex and distance travelled to work is true only for operative and service workers and farm laborers. The relationship is barely significant for sales and clerical workers and not significant at all for professional and managerial personnel. In short, the overall analysis reveals that the situation with the rural female worker does not coincide with the image of her urban counterpart. Both in an absolute sense and relative to rural males, the rural female is not typically travelling great distances to work, especially if she is employed in semi-skilled or manual occupations. While it is true that the "modern" rural female is employed to a greater degree and in a wider variety of occupations than before (Bryant, et al., 1979) the image of the female worker "liberated" from home and locality is not supported by the physical distances travelled to work revealed in this chapter.

The relationship between distance travelled to work and the rest of the demographic variables (age, race, and marital status) is either slightly significant or not significant at all. These relationships are presented in Tables 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7. The relationship between distance travelled to work and age is mildly significant, as the figures in Table 4.5 demonstrate. The source of the significance which is existent is not clearly demonstrated. It would appear to derive from the fact, however, those in the eldest category (66+) overwhelmingly work near home, over 91 percent living 15 miles or less from home.

As far as the other two demographic variables are concerned, race and marital status, there is observed absolutely no relationship with distance travelled to work. There is some slight tendency for white respondents to report working closer to home than nonwhite residents (Table 4.6), but the differences could as easily be attributed to chance as to anything else. The data in Table 4.7 indicate that married people travel greater distances to work than nonmarried people, particularly those divorced, separated, or widowed. Again, however, the differences could be chance occurrences and could possibly be influenced by the previously-discussed tendency of those over 65 years of age (many of whom may be widowed) to work close to home or to be retired.

D. Socio-Economic Relationships

Previous studies of distance travelled to work have generally found a positive relationship with socio-economic factors, such as education and occupation (Reeder, 1956; McKay, 1973; Guest, 1975; 1976). The relationships between education and occupation and distance travelled to work in the present study are presented in Tables 4.8 and 4.9, respectively

Interestingly, the data shown in Table 4.8 reveal the absence of a relationship between education and distance travelled to work. The gamma statistic is positive, but the figure is so close to zero as to indicate that virtually no relationship exists between the two variables. Still, it is noteworthy to point out that those with the highest levels of education, beyond college, have both the highest percentage of those working within 16 miles from home and the lowest percentage, by far, of those working over 40 miles from home. The small number of people in this category (30) may have prevented any divergences from the rest of the sample from emerging as significant. The data suggest, however, that in rural areas, as contrasted with urban areas, the well-educated dwellers stay closer home to work while the less-educated residents go farther from their homes and communities to their jobs.

With respect to the final factor analyzed for this chapter, major occupation of respondent, the results are clear - there exists within this sample of rural residents a very strong relationship between distance travelled to work and major occupation (Table 4.9). The percentage breakdowns suggest that it is those in the skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled occupations who travel the greatest distances to work (with the exceptions of private household-housewife and farm laborer occupations). On the other hand, those in professional, managerial, and clerical occupations tend to work close to home (see also, Bryant, et al., 1980). This finding is in contrast to recent analyses which suggest that, in older metropolitan areas, distance travelled to work is directly related to occupational status (professional-managerial = higher status; skilled-unskilled = lower status) (Guest, 1976). The results of the present analysis also

fail to support a recent study of rural industrial employees in which no relationship was found between distance travelled to work and occupation (Clemente and Summers, 1975).

E. Conclusions

The results in this chapter are in contrast both with previous travel to work analyses conducted in urban areas, and a recent investigation of travel to work patterns of rural workers. The responses thus far analyzed provide little in the way of a pattern which clearly depicts travel to work in rural areas. It is clear, for example, that the respondents in our sample are working near their homes. Whether this situation is the result of preference or lack of resources to travel greater distances to work, however, is uncertain and in need of additional investigation.

With few exceptions, the distribution of travel to work distances is spread fairly evenly throughout the social structure of the populations surveyed. The two exceptions to this generalization are sex and major occupation. Males travel greater distances to work than females. Upper-occupational status males, however, work closer to their homes than other males. This situation is somewhat true for females, but the relationship is less pronounced than for males. In addition, lower-occupational status females work closer to home significantly more often than their male counterparts, even when housewives are excluded from the analysis.

While it is true that the female's role in American society is changing, especially in relation to occupational patterns, the data in this chapter suggest that this change is unevenly occurring, at least in rural areas. Additional analysis in this report indicates that the rural

female of the late 1970's is employed in greater numbers and in many more diversified occupations than a generation or two ago. The data in this chapter suggest, however, that the change is not complete. The rural female worker is not "hitting the road," so to speak, in search of a job. Rather, it would appear from these results that the rural female, especially the working-class female, is finding her source of employment near her home, unlike her male counterpart.

Finally, the often noted tendency of upper-status workers living in metropolitan suburbs to go into the city to work, or vice versa, is not established in this study. Again, whether this situation reflects a reasoned choice of these workers, who might prefer to live and work in places where one would expect their prestige and influence to be quite high, or necessity born of lack of reasonable transportation facilities to convey them greater distances to work, is uncertain and also in need of further investigation.

Table 4.1. Frequency Distributions of Travel to Work Factors (Respondents).

Factors	
Distance Travelled (one-way)	Range = 1 mile or less-100 miles or more Median = 2.5 miles Mode = 1 mile
Location	Inside the Community = 48.1 percent Outside the Community = 29.1 percent Both Inside and Outside = 19.0 percent No response = 3.9 percent
Mode	Private Car = 46.0 percent Car Pool = 5.0 percent Public Transportation = 0.6 percent Walking = 20.7 percent Undetermined = 27.7 percent
Time	Range = 1 minute or less-100 minutes or more Median = 5.4 minutes Mode = Less than 1 minute

Table 4.2. Distance Travelled to Work by County (In Percents).

Distance (one-way miles)	County				N
	Cumberland	Middlesex	Rappahannock	Craig	
0-15	71.4	80.9	74.1	68.2	385
16-40	13.5	9.7	13.9	27.3	80
41 +	15.1	9.7	12.2	4.5	55
Total	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	
N	126	145	139	110	520

$x^2 = 21.92$, 6 d.f., $p < .001$

Table 4.3. Distance Travelled to Work by Intentions of Leaving the Community. Total Sample (In Percents).

Distance (one-way miles)	Intentions to Leave		N
	Yes	No	
0-15	76.9	72.6	269
16-40	12.8	14.9	54
41 +	10.3	12.5	45
Total	100.0	100.0	
N	39	329	368

$x^2 = 0.33$; 2 d.f., n.s.

Table 4.4. Distance Travelled to Work by Sex of Respondent - Total Sample (In Percents).

Distance (one-way miles)	Sex		
	Male	Female	N
0-15	65.0	85.8	385
16-40	20.1	9.3	80
41 +	15.0	4.9	55
Total	100.1	100.0	
N	294	226	520

Table 4.5. Distance Travelled to Work by Age of Respondent - Total Sample (In Percents).

Distance (one-way miles)	Age						
	17-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-65	66+	N
0-15	69.6	66.7	69.3	73.6	77.4	91.1	385
16-40	21.4	19.2	20.2	14.9	9.5	5.1	79
41 +	8.9	14.1	10.5	11.5	13.1	3.8	55
Total	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
N	56	99	114	87	84	79	519

$x^2 = 21.22$, 10 d.f., $p < .02$

Table 4.6. Distance Travelled to Work by Race of Respondent - Total Sample (In Percents).

Distance (one-way miles)	Race		
	White	Nonwhite	N
0-15	74.7	69.7	383
16-40	15.6	14.5	80
41 +	9.7	15.8	55
Total	100.0	100.0	
N	442	76	518

$x^2 = 2.51$, 2 d.f., n.s.

Table 4.7. Distance Travelled to Work by Marital Status of Respondents - Total Sample (In Percents).

Distance (one-way miles)	Marital Status			
	Married	Single	Divorced Seperated, Widowed	N
0-15	73.0	74.5	86.8	384
16-40	15.2	19.6	10.5	79
41 +	11.9	5.9	2.6	55
Total	100.1	100.0	99.9	
N	429	51	38	518

$x^2 = 6.11$, 4 d.f., n.s.

Table 4.8. Distance Travelled to Work by Education of Respondents - Total Sample (In Percents).

Distance (one-way miles)	Education (years)				
	0-8	9-12	13-16	17 +	N
0-15	79.3	71.6	72.4	80.0	385
16-40	10.7	17.0	16.3	16.7	80
41 +	9.9	11.4	11.2	3.3	55
Total	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.0	
N	121	271	98	30	520

Table 4.9. Distance Travelled to Work by Major Occupation of Respondents - Total Sample (In Percents).

Distance (one-way miles)	Major Occupation				
	Prof., Tech., Kindred	Managers, Adm., Except Farm	Sales	Clerical and Kindred	Craftsmen and Kindred
0-15	63.6	66.7	76.0	63.3	47.5
16-40	25.0	15.2	12.0	23.3	31.1
41 +	11.4	18.2	12.0	13.3	21.3
Total	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.9	99.9
N	44	33	25	30	61

	Operatives, Except Transport	Transport Operatives	Laborers, Except Farm	Farmers, Farm Managers	Farm Laborers, Foremen
0-15	56.3	45.5	45.2	92.9	80.0
16-40	21.9	54.5	29.0	7.1	20.0
41 +	21.9	0.0	25.8	0.0	0.0
Total	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	32	11	31	42	5

	Service Workers, Except Private Household	Private Household (Includes housewives)	N
0-15	74.1	92.9	322
16-40	18.5	1.8	78
41 +	7.4	5.3	54
Total	100.0	100.0	
N	27	113	454

$x^2 = 85.53$, 22 d.f., $p < .001$

CHAPTER 5

OCCUPATIONAL SKILLS

Thus far, a number of points concerning the occupational structure have been discussed that would be of considerable interest in rural development. First, it was noted that the occupational structure of rural areas in Virginia has changed dramatically. There is a diversified occupational structure, women are involved in the entire range of occupations, many workers are traveling great distances to work, and the level of satisfaction is about the same as in urban areas. Most importantly, the occupational structure is more extensive than previously noted. Over 30 percent of the workers interviewed had more than one job. The division of labor in these rural counties is far more complete than official records would indicate.

We turn now to an examination of occupational resources that are available to the counties which are not at present being used. On the questionnaire, a question was asked concerning the occupational skills of workers that were not being utilized. Forty-nine percent of the respondents reported that they had skills they were not currently using in their regular occupation. These skills range across all major occupational categories and represent a large number of specific occupational skills. What they demonstrate is a significant capacity for rural development that is as yet untapped. In this section, we will explore these findings.

We begin by examining the distribution of skills by major occupational categories. Table 5.1 shows the distribution for all four counties. Note that in the list there is a concentration of craft skills.

In the chapter on multiple jobs, we noted that craft occupations were used as a major source of secondary incomes. The potential of craft occupations is far greater than is being realized. Based on our sampling plan, we can estimate that there are over 1100 people in the four counties that could engage in such occupations. These skills are roughly equally divided among modern crafts (automobile, farm equipment work, carpentry, plumbing) and traditional crafts (woodworking, quilting, metal work). Thus, the major source of skills is in the craft area.

This finding is not surprising for two reasons. First, given the spatial location of the residents of rural counties, skills are more likely to be those which do not require an elaborate technology. Secondly, such skills can be acquired from the general environment of rural life. Most public schools have a well-developed program of vocational education and other crafts, the more traditional ones, are still widely practiced as either primary or secondary occupations (see Chapter 2). Thus, both the technology and the training exist. It is also true that the market for such crafts exists, as evidenced by the rapid growth in craft stores.

The second largest set of occupational skills not in use is among machine operatives. This probably reflects the training of males in shop classes in high schools and a number of women trained in textile work, but who have quit work for one reason or another.

The third largest category of unused skills are clerical skills. Again, we believe that this situation reflects the business vocational tranining in senior high schools and junior college systems in Virginia.

Strangely enough, the unused occupational skills include the professional category. We found 24 people in our sample who were in the

professional category. Generalizing to the population, this means that there are 288 people in the four counties who have professional training that is, at present, not in use. Several of these professionally trained people are retired or are married nurses or school teachers. It is unexpected, however, to find so many in four counties picked for their rurality.

To further examine the distribution of unused skills, we compared males and females. Table 5.2 shows the skills structure of males and females. There are three observations that need some comment, and they concern the unequal distribution of unused skills in the categories of clerical, crafts and operatives.

(1) As expected, the larger number of people with clerical skills not being employed are female. Most people receiving clerical skills are female and, in the case of the females in this study, most respondents reporting clerical training not in use were housewives who had no other income-producing job. Several of the men and women had retired. Most of the people with clerical skills listed specifically typist and some form of shorthand. These skills involve courses common to high school vocational training.

(2) Most of the crafts workers (85 out of 95) were male. Most of these craft skills were also a result of the vocational training of the males. The most frequently mentioned craft skill was welding, followed by masonry, carpentry and woodworking. The female skills centered around traditional crafts, such as, seamstress and cooking.

(3) Most of the operative skills were reported by females, and most of these crafts centered around textile and sewing machines. For instance, 71 women reported sewing machine operator in one of the counties, Rappahannock County.

In general, we found among both males and females a wide variety of skills (including professional training) that are available to the local community. We found that these skills are sometimes used in community service, but not in income-producing jobs. Given the range of skills for both males and females, it is obvious to us that more indepth research on the skills available to local communities is needed.

We made one other observation concerning the distribution of skills in the counties. Table 5.3 shows the distribution of several skills by age. We divided age into three categories: young, middle ages and aged. Young refers to people under 45 years of age, middle ages is 45-65 years old, and aged refers to people over 65. In general, the younger workers are more likely to have unused skills, particularly in the occupational categories of crafts, operatives and clerical workers. Most professional skills are also held by younger workers, as well as various service skills.

This finding could be indicative to two trends in rural life. First, younger workers are more broadly trained. There has been an expansion of vocational education in the United States since the middle 1950's. This expansion has included not only the development of vocational education courses in high school, but during the 1960's and 1970's, a rapid growth in junior college with a heavy vocational education component. In chapter 2, we demonstrated that the occupational structure of the rural areas was diversified, which in itself would require an increase in the number of skills needed. These data show that, in fact, our system of education, both formal and informal, has produced an abundance of skills on the part of workers. It must be remembered that most of these unused skills are reported by people holding jobs. Given that the greatest proportion of these skills is held by younger workers, it is a direct reflection of educational trends.

The second possible implication of the distribution of skills by age is that younger workers may have to take jobs that do not maximize their skills in order to remain in rural areas. The migration from rural areas to urban areas is well documented. It has become difficult for younger workers to remain in rural areas and find jobs that provide a satisfactory style of life. Well-trained people may be forced to take jobs that do not fit their training. Additional research on the occupational structure and the distribution of skills in rural areas is certainly needed. The research reported here can only point to the fact that significant unused skills exist in rural areas.

It is interesting to note that the older people report farming as an unused occupational skill. Only one younger worker reported farming, while eight older workers did so. In the four-county area, this would mean that almost 100 older people claim farming as an unused skill. Among younger workers this is not the case. Farming is the only area where significantly more older people claim an unused skill.

Finally, we must note an inconsistency between the distribution of occupations and skills. In Chapter 2, it is noted that the distribution of people by occupation has become more diversified and that the rural distribution, like the urban, has moved toward an equal distribution of people in each occupational category. This is not the case in the distribution of unused occupational skills. In fact, 70 percent of the unused skills are represented by only three occupational categories - clerical, crafts, and operatives. Other skills, such as management, sales, and transport, are represented by less than two percent of the population even though the demand for such skills is climbing. This result suggests that some rethinking concerning occupational training in rural areas needs to be considered.

We have now examined the occupational structure, job satisfaction, distance to work and the distribution of unused skills. In the following chapter, we examine some general notions of occupational structure of rural areas and how changes toward an urban society might impact on rural areas.

Table 5.1. The Distribution of Unused Occupational Skills by Major Occupational Categories in Four Virginia Counties.

Major Occupational Category	- N -
Professional	24
Manager	4
Sales	4
Clerical	44
Crafts	95
Operatives	50
Transport	8
Labor	16
Farmer	6
Farm Labor	2
Service	12
Private Household	4

Table 5.2. The Distribution of Unused Occupational Skills by Sex.

Occupational Category	Male	Female
Professions	10	14
Managers	2	2
Sales	2	2
Clerical	10	34
Crafts	85	10
Operatives	8	42
Transport	7	1
Labor	10	6
Farmer	6	0
Farm Labor	2	0
Service	2	10
Private Household	0	4
Totals	144	125

Table 5.3. Distribution of Occupation Skills by Age in Four Counties in Virginia.

Occupational Category	Young	Middle	Aged
Professions	16	5	0
Managers	2	2	4
Sales	2	1	0
Clerical	36	8	1
Crafts	40	38	0
Operatives	28	14	17
Transport	6	1	8
Labor	3	5	1
Farmer	1	3	8
Farm Labor	1	1	2
Service	10	1	0
Private Household	2	1	1
Totals (N)	147	80	42

CHAPTER 6

THE IMPOSITION OF URBAN OCCUPATIONAL PATTERNS ON TRADITIONAL RURAL LIFE

Introduction

The status of world development is such that at once there remain hunting and gathering societies, agricultural societies and industrial societies. The early industrial states have experienced the more normal development of moving from one type of social organization to another, and each type developing fully before it is replaced by a succeeding form of social organization. That is to say, that in the European and North American industrial societies, each form of social organization developed naturally from forces, both social and economic, generated by the preceeding form. Thus, the industrial United States developed from agricultural America only after the agricultural technology was fully developed.

Such natural progressions have become rare in an era of rapid communication and transportation. Much more likely in a world of international trade is the imposition of one type of social organization upon another. For instance, the importation of an urban technology on an agricultural society has become a usual form of cultural transmission. Many times such efforts are viewed by the culture imposed upon as an invasion. The United States and Russia, as the "superpowers" of the world are often viewed by other nations as imperalistic in their efforts to impose an industrial technology on an agricultural society.

In fact, there are factors imbedded in the industrial form of social organization that are contradictory to agricultural society. These factors, in fact, do not require that one move from one society to

another to observe their effect on the patterns of community life. In this study, we will show that the spread of an urban society within the United States has created similar cultural contradictions for the residents of the rural areas of the United States (Coughenour and Kowalski, 1977; Ellis, 1975; Heffernan and Lasley, 1978).

More specifically, we will deal with the impact of a rapidly changing occupational structure on the exchange system of local communities in rural areas of the state of Virginia in the Southeastern United States. The Southeastern states, unlike the Northern states remained primarily agricultural areas until World War II. In the time since that war, the development of an industrial form of social organization has been severe. The resulting changes in occupational structure, as well as the age and sex composition of rural communities present severe developmental problems for the local community. Basically, these problems fall into three general areas:

(1) The population base of the rural community is not large enough to provide a complete industrial exchange system. With an increase in occupational diversification, some goods and services that are a normal part of the industrial exchange system are difficult to provide in the rural areas. Thus, the shortage of workers in rural areas will lead to an increase in number of people with multiple occupations.

(2) Further, the rural area does not have the industrial base to provide work for all its members. The first "industrialization" occurs in agricultural technology. As the technology of agriculture is improved, the number of workers needed for farm work declines. In the rural areas of this study, this has resulted in the rapid decline of total population

as people move to urban areas and, equally important to an increase in the number of people who live in the rural area but work in other areas.

(3) Finally, the change in occupational structure has increased the number of women engaged in income producing work. Additionally, with the exodus of younger people to urban areas, the age composition of the rural area is altered, such that women become an essential part of the occupational structure of the community. Further, women become the basic "untapped resource" of rural development.

Findings

The findings in this chapter will be presented in these major parts:

1) The change in the population of workers from 1940-1980
2) The redistribution of workers from 1940-1980
3) The participation of workers in secondary occupations in 1980
4) The number of workers who leave the local community daily
5) The changing participation of women in the occupational life of the community.

1. The population of workers

Our sample of 541 workers is a systematic sample of the four county area in 1979. Of the 541 respondents we find that between them and their spouses there were 759 income-producing jobs. If we take this base figure and generalize it to the four county area, there were 6019 people with an income-producing job in 1979. In 1940, according to the U.S. Census, there were 7930 income-producing occupations in the counties. These both exclude both retired people and housewives. Thus, the decline in the population (from 25,155 in 1940 to 20,081 in 1979), is reflected in the number of workers in income-producing occupations. The proportion of the population working in 1940 was 30 percent. The proportion working in 1979 was 30 percent.

Secondly, we can examine the distribution of workers by major occupation. Table 6.1 shows the percentage of workers in income-producing jobs for 1940 and 1979 and the change in percent of workers during that period. During the period from 1940 through 1979, professional, clerical-sales, craft and service occupations increased by more than 5 percent. At the same time, farmer and farm labor occupations were held by 50 percent of the workers in our four counties. In 1979, only 12.3 percent of the workers were engaged in farming. The workers became more evenly distributed among all occupations. In 1940, the Gibbs and Martin (1962) measure of occupational dispersion is .80. In 1979, it is .91, much closer to the 1.0 score, which demonstrates equal distribution. Thus, from 1940 to 1979 the occupational structure changed from monolithic agrarian to dispersed industrial.

The change in occupation dispersion scores give some notion as to the severity of the changes taking place. Farmers and farm managers declined by two-thirds. In Cumberland County, for instance, there were 1009 farmers in 1940. In 1970, there were only 226 farmers. Additionally, the rural exchange system has undergone significant change. The proportion of clerical and sales workers has increased by five times--in a period of declining population. The rural community becomes more urban-like in both its occupational structure and its exchange system.

Thirdly, in 1979, we found that a little over 30 percent of the income-producing workers in the four rural counties had second jobs. In our sample 156 respondents, 29.7 percent of the total sample, and 33 percent of the income producing workers held second jobs. Table 6.2 shows the distribution of these workers' second occupations by the same categories used in Table 6.1. In the table the numbers represent the number of residents of the counties with second jobs generalized

from the sample. The first important finding from an examination of Table 6.2 is that farming has become a part-time job for many rural residents.

Note that 312 people in the counties studied continue to farm as a second job. In the course of our study we found a state patrolman, a newspaper columnist, a county agent, a druggist, and several retired people, among others, who listed farming as a part-time effort. While the small, labor intensive farm is no longer a viable first occupation, a number of people continue to maintain the family farm.

The second major observation is the use of craft industries as a second job. Crafts fall into two parts: first, there is the traditional crafts. Quilting, food preserving, wood carving, pottery and knife making are crafts where the product is intended for external trade, that is, it is intended to be sold outside the local community. The second form of craft, modern crafts, includes auto repair, television repair, air conditioners, cement finishers, and so on. These crafts are primarily service oriented and are intended for the internal use of the community. The modern crafts are another indication of the changing nature of rural life. Because demand is not great enough to require full-time workers, many industrial crafts are performed on a part-time basis. Further, since the traditional crafts are essentially exports, they are not part of the local exchange system.

Finally, it should be noted farm labor constitutes an insignificant proportion of the part-time jobs of the community, but all other occupational categories have a significant number of part-time workers. Combined with the data on major occupations, it is clear that the part-

time work reflects a clear change of the occupational structure of the rural community.

Our fourth observation concerns the number of workers whose job is outside the county. Byrant, et al. (1980) have reported that the workers in these rural counties average over 15 miles in a one way trip to work. Some of the workers travel in excess of 100 miles on a one way trip. If the worker travels to work daily, this would equal over 50,000 miles a year on the trip to work. Given these great distances, it is surprising that a number of the workers do not work in the local community.

In fact, 37 percent of the residents in these rural counties work outside of their county of residence. Fifty percent of the males and 22 percent of the females journey to a different county for work. Thus, a significant proportion of the community are residents only, creating, in effect, a rural suburb. Again, the shift to an urban industrial society is reflected by this outcome.

Finally, we point to the participation of women in the labor force. In 1940, women represented only 13 percent of the income producing workers, in 1979, they represent 43 percent of the income producing workers. Thus, the distribution of income-producing work by sex in rural areas is similar to that of urban areas. Table 6.3 shows the proportion of women workers by occupational category in 1940 and in 1970. The most significant result to the gleaned from this table is that women make up a larger proportion of workers in each category, except for the professional area. (Women were school teachers - about the only professional occupation in rural counties in 1940.) What is interesting

about this table is that it conforms to the national patterns of the distribution of women in the occupational system. Prior to 1940, women represented a major "untapped resource" in rural areas. That is significantly less true today.

In summary, we find that in 39 years, four rural counties in Virginia have become less rural and more urban in nature. The occupational structure, the suburban nature of residents as work place, and the use of women in the labor force all have changed significantly. What has changed less is the values concerning rural life.

2. The Desire to Preserve Rural Life

If there is a single predominant feature to the conversations with the people of the four counties studied, it would be their allegiance to the "rural way of life." Dudley (forthcoming) found that, when asked what people liked best about a rural county, it was the agrarian life style. Many of the newer residents of these counties move there to return to more traditional values and a different (non-urban) way of life.

We would argue that such is not the case. In these four counties in Virginia, which were picked because of their rurality, a very non-rural occupational structure was found. The "rurality" discussed by the residents really has to do with other factors. True, there are more farmers here than in the city, but in fact, they are a small part of the rural division of labor and of local exchange systems. The most prevelant worker is the suburban commuter, who travels some distance to a urban center for a job in industrial society. American Gothic is replaced by a two-car family with husband and wife both leaving for income-producing jobs each morning.

The question is, how long can the values, attitudes, and beliefs about rural life stay as they are when the structural conditions have changed so completely? At the moment, one can only speculate. One speculation is that rural sociologists foster the continuation of these values in the way in which they ask questions. As Bryant, et al. (1979) have noted, the only thing that remains relatively the same is the scenery. The people are "hustling" to "stay alive" and "get ahead."

The other possibility, of course, is that the structure of rural life is changing so rapidly (in less than two generations) that the values remain even though the structure has changed. If this is the case, rural areas are an excellent place to begin to observe anomie. The shift from a mechanical to an organic solidarity has occurred in the industrialized country. When this is recognized by the residents, "rural life" as distinct from urban life, will disappear.

Table 6.1. Income Producing Jobs, Percent and Percent Change in Each Occupation Category, 1940 and 1979. (Some categories combined to account for change in Census.)

Categories	1940	1979	Change
Professional	3.8	10.8	+ 7.0
Manager	5.0	8.6	+ 3.6
Clerical-Sales	3.6	15.2	+11.6
Craft	6.4	16.8	+10.4
Operative-Transport	5.7	11.7	+ 6.0
Labor, Except Farm	10.4	8.4	- 2.0
Farmer, Manager	32.5	10.4	-22.1
Farm Labor	16.7	1.0	-14.8
Service	2.1	7.6	+ 5.5
Private Household	5.5	1.6	- 3.9
Other	8.3	7.0	- 1.3
	100%	100%	0.0

Table 6.2. Occupational Distribution of Second Jobs. n and Percent N - 1872 (156)*.

Categories	n	Percent
Professional	156 (13)	8.0
Manager	60 (5)	3.0
Clerical-Sales	168 (14)	9.0
Craft	468 (39)	25.0
Operative Transport	288 (24)	15.0
Labor	144 (12)	8.0
Farmer, Manager	312 (26)	17.0
Farm Laborer	24 (2)	0.4
Service	156 (13)	8.0
Private Household	96 (8)	5.0
Other	24 (2)	
Totals	1872 (156)	(99.8%)*

* ( ) = sample N
** due to rounding, percent ≠ 100

Table 6.3. The Proportion of the Income Producing Work Force that is Female, 1940 and 1970, by Occupational Category.*

	1940	1970
Professional	.92	.43
Manager	.12	.42
Clerical Sales	.30	.35
Crafts	.05	.02
Operatives-Transport	.09	.31
Labor	.01	.03
Farmer, Farm Manager	.04	.07
Farm Labor	.00	.42
Service	.42	.70
Private	.91	.93

* Housewives and retired people excluded.

CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Demographic change generally precipitates social change. In the instance of the rural United States, recent years have seen two discernible demographic changes, both of which have been documented by researchers. These changes have been particularly discernible in the South. The changes include a stablization in both the number of farms and farm operators, and a counter-urbanization trend. There is evidence of a population movement away from the metropolitan areas back to non-metropolitan areas -- a return to the grass roots, as it were. These population changes in the rural areas of the southeastern U.S. (and other parts of the country) would suggest an accelerated tempo of rural development and social change.

Social Change and the Division of Labor

The social changes concomittant to the population changes have included alterations in the rural division of labor and occupational structure, as well as changes in rural life. The smaller "family farms" have, in many instances, given way to an agri-business mode. Significant numbers of persons who continued to maintain farms also took up full-time, off-farm jobs. Additional persons in farming undertook to hold part-time jobs. Part-time farming has become a constituent way of work and life in the rural setting. Furthermore, substantial numbers of non-farm households are joining the farm population in rural areas. These trends have brought about changes in occupational structure and rural community life has come to more closely resemble urban community life than in the

past, as has the distribution of goods and services. The rural community has come to embrace more complex economic relationships, and as rural residents become more dependent on the income of more than one occupation, this multiple job structure comes to form a more unified system of exchange.

Social and economic change are subject to an element of cultural lag, however, and as rural America comes to resemble urban society, there is, presumably, an unevenness in the process of technological and economic adaptation. In short, the urban technology and the economic modes of exchange are not immediately inculcated into rural lifestyles. Intervening variables such as extant attitudes, the ongoing sense of rural community, and differential processes of learning the new technologies and economic ways, may all well intrude on the metamorphosis. This study sought to gain insight into the transformation of rural to urban occupational structure and exchange system. Toward this end, it specifically focused on four dimensions of occupational division of labor in rural areas. These dimensions included socio-demographic parameters such as age, sex, race, and occupation; the degree of involvement in multiple job holding; the economic and social-psychological motives for participation in multiple job structures; and the impact on the rural occupational structure. The study was largely exploratory and aimed at a better understanding of the phenomena under study rather than hypothesis testing.

The research project undertook to study a sample population in four counties of Virginia, each representing a geo-cultural area of the state. The counties included Cumberland in the Piedmont area of the state, Middlesex County in the Chesapeake area, Rappahannock County in the northern Shenandoah Valley area, and Craig County in the highland, "boot," section of the state. The sample population involved 145, 146,

139, and 111 persons in the four counties, respectively. In-depth interviews with the sample populations, representing upwards of 600 households around the state, were taken and these interviews formed the basis of the research data to be analyzed.

Multiple Job Holding and the Attendant Occupational Structure

An analysis of the data generated from the interviews revealed a number of interesting findings of sociological import. The rural dwellers tended to resemble urban dwellers in terms of the distribution of occupations. A relatively full range of occupational specialties was represented and the distribution of the respondents in these occupational categories was relatively even. Thus, rather than a monolithic occupational structure comprised entirely of agriculturally related jobs, a division of labor of urban-like complexity was encountered. This is in sharp contrast to earlier periods. In 1940, for example, in these same areas, more than one-half the workers were directly involved in agricultural work. The stereotypical image of the farmer as the sole inhabitant of the rural area is simply eroneous. The hired hand or farm laborer has virtually disappeared and the number of farm operators has diminished greatly. The rural context has become the habitat of a much wider range of work specialties.

Interestingly, the occupational category with the largest number of people encountered in the study was craft occupations. These crafts included various kinds of vehicle and equipment repair, as well as different kinds of traditional and/or creative crafts such as furniture refinishing and quilting, to name two. Even knife making was encountered. The rural dweller traditionally had to be self-reliant and innovative since he did not have easy access to goods or services. In effect, he had to be a "jack-of-all-trades," and such a heritage would seem to nourish and perpetuate craft skills. In some instances, individuals had presumably carried on

and perfected secondary crafts that had been component to the family repertoire of skills for generations. In other instances, necessity or desire had prompted the acquisition of new crafts skills. The rural setting, with its space and relatively unstructured time parameters, no doubt tends to foster the development of craft skills. Unquestionably, some individuals have migrated to the rural areas in order to have time and opportunity to practice craft skills -- a kind of "back to basics" movement.

Even though the rural setting tends to have an urban-life occupational structure, the occupation of housewife remains somewhat more prominent in rural life than in urban life. As in farming, the practice of craft skills, is not infrequently home-centered and thus, the logistical and maintenance needs attendant to the home are quite important with the constituent need for someone to discharge these responsibilities.

Perhaps the most surprising finding of the study was the very significant percentage of individuals in the rural areas who hold down multiple jobs. "Moonlighting," or multiple job holding, and the frenetic pace of life that not infrequently attends such a practice, is generally associated with urban life. In this study it was found that approximately one-third of the labor force held more than one job. This is a considerably greater frequency of multiple jobs than might have been anticipated, and the hectic pace of life that presumably is concomittant with more than one job is also unanticipated. While some of the "moonlighting" encountered undoubtably results from a need for extra income, some of it also presumably derives from a desire to develop new creative and productive outlets. Individuals may be better able to fulfill themselves through a second occupational specialty. This argument would appear to be supported by the fact of such a significant proportion of the respondents pursuing a craft skill as a second job.

Farming as an occupation is still encountered, but largely as a second job. Mechanization now allows people to maintain a small farm as a "sideline" in addition to holding down a full-time job. Even if farming as a sole occupational pursuit will not yield an income sufficient to support a family in most instances, it can be a lucrative sideline, and perhaps, more importantly, it offers the opportunity to retain linkages with the rural ambience and culture. All occupational categories are represented among the second jobs of the respondents, including professionals, sales jobs, and truck driving to name but a few. It would appear that the rural dewllers in the areas studied are able to effectively "fit into" more than one place in the labor force, and this ability tends to significantly augment the rural system of production and exchange of goods and services.

Moonlighting apparently affords not only the chance to economically maintain themselves and their families in the face of inflationary trends, to survive, as it were. It also allows them the opportunity to improve their lifestyle and to better fulfill themselves as productive members of society. Moreover, the multiple jobs of rural residents contribute significantly to the development of a complex and relatively complete system of exchange of goods and services.

Rural Work and Job Satisfaction

An elaborate body of previous research work has demonstrated that job satisfaction among workers is an important dimension of productivity and socially positive behavior, and thus the economic vitality and growth of a community or area. In this connection, studies have shown that most American workers are satisfied with their jobs (albeit with fluctuation over the years). Job satisfaction has been shown to be

positively related to the worker's social and economic status in society, white-collar as opposed to blue-collar work, age, income, and education, but not necessarily sex. Unfortunately, most studies of job satisfaction have been conducted in urban settings.

This study probed this concern among our rural sample. Data analysis suggested that job satisfaction among the respondents, as among urban dwellers, was quite high. The question of multiple-job holding and job satisfaction was explored, and multiple job holders seem to be no more or less satisfied with their major occupation than single job holders. In some areas of the country, job satisfaction has been shown to be related to distance to work traveled by individuals. The data in this study show no statistical relationship between job satisfaction and distance traveled to work. In this instance, the lack of a relationship may have indicated an indifference to, or stoicism concerning the distance and cost factors associated with travel to work. Some other studies have demonstrated, however, that there are various other considerations, such as housing, overall quality of life, or children's education, that tend to compensate or offset the disadvantages associated with travel to work. In the case of rural dwellers this is very likely the case. Individuals sought the rural context as a place to live. The advantages of life in the rural area, including lower taxes, space, privacy, a more desirable ecology, community closeness, and enhanced quality of life, to name some, were the features sought by persons migrating to rural areas, or those electing to remain there, and the problem of longer commuting distances was recognized by them and initially discounted as a disaffective concern. Rising energy costs and increased pressures to conserve fuel could well alter this frame of mind, however. Nevertheless, when asked did they intend to leave the community (a widely used indicator of one's current

and future prospects in life), the preponderance of respondents indicated that they did not intend to leave the community, and the majority of those were also in the "very satisfied" or "satisfied" with their job category. Apparently individuals in rural areas are realistically aware of the trade-off between travel to work and quality of life, and are willing to pay the price with a minimum of disgruntlement.

Further analysis of the data suggest little difference between males and females in terms of job satisfaction, although whites appear to be somewhat more satisfied with their jobs than non-whites. Both of these findings are in line with previous national studies. Also consistent with urban studies are the findings in this project that job satisfaction tends to increase with age, and with education. One contradictory trend is that persons with more than a college degree display the highest percentage of job dissatisfaction (although a much lower percentage than indicated job satisfaction) as well as a very high degree of job satisfaction. This trend may be results of conflicts between the rewards of urban life and the lack of urban amenities and cultural opportunities.

In terms of type of occupation, there did not appear to be any significant differences in job satisfaction, although some differences in ranges of job satisfaction among some occupational types are evident. In general, however, this rural sample did not display the relationship of occupational type and job satisfaction found in many urban studies. Finally, there appeared to be little difference in job satisfaction between working women and housewives in this rural population, in contradiction to the image of the dissaffected urban housewife. The centrality of the home in both work systems and social activities and

the attendant importance attached to the role of housewife may well be a factor in this situation of job satisfaction.

Overall, it would seem that the rural dwelling, whether a full or part-time farmer, or an individual accomplishing to hold down two or more urban-type occupations with the attendant need for long commuting distances, or even the rural housewife, all are essentially in the rural context volitionally, seeking and obtaining the benefits and rewards of rural life and culture, albeit with trade-off costs, and willing to accept the situation in exchange for job satisfaction and contentment.

Travel to Work

The problem of commuting to work, especially in today's fuel conscious times is often a very important aspect of the job and the occupational structure of a locality. In probing this dimension of work, the study revealed that, on the average, the respondents worked close to home, traveling only a relatively short distance to work, and traveling usually, by private conveyance. Although car-pooling was mentioned by very few of those interviewed, there is reason to believe that many rural dwellers use a variation of a car pool to travel to work. Each person might use their own vechicle to travel part way to work and then meet other workers along the way, leaving their cars at "car stations" along the highway routes to their jobs. This arrangement offers some advantages of both travel by personal vechicle and car-pooling. Distance traveled to work is also a function of the local situation and, in this regard, there were some discernible differences in the patterns of commuting to work from county to county in the study. Interestingly, there appeared to be no relationship between a respondent's intention to leave the community and the distance traveled to work each day. Commuting

apparently is something one simply comes to accept with the community context.

Additionally, it appears that males travel greater distances to work than females, even excluding housewives. This may well result in the fact that males need to pursue better paying occupational specialties that are not as frequently represented in the immediate vicinity as some female jobs, and, in effect, they must travel further afield, to find jobs in their particular line of work. There appears to be little if any significant relationship between distance traveled to work and age, race, or sex. Similarly, no significant relationship between education and distance traveled to work was found. There is, however, a strong relationship between major occupation and distance to work. In contrast to studies in some urban areas, which showed that higher status workers traveled the furtherest distance to work, the data from this rural population suggested the opposite. Those in higher status occupations tended to work close to home and those in lower status occupations had to travel a greater distance to work. In the urban areas the high status occupational practioners presumably lived in the more desireable suburban areas and had to commute to the center of the city, while the lower status workers, living closer to the center had less distance to travel to work. In the rural areas under study, the higher status occupations had accomplished to find work closer at hand and may well have located their home close to their work by design. The lower status workers, on the other hand, were perhaps less fortunate and had to travel further to find work appropriate to their skills and qualifications.

Occupational Skills

Although a significant number of the individuals in the sample had a second occupation, there were additional nonutilized skills among the

population studied. Almost one-half of the respondents reported skills not currently used in their regular occupation. The nonutilized skills were largely in the craft area, including modern crafts and traditional crafts. Crafts do not require an elaborate technology and can often be acquired from the general environment of rural life. There was, however, a substantial reservoir of machine skills and clerical skills, probably deriving from trade and vocational courses in high schools and community colleges. There were even untapped professional skills in the sample.

In general, the females had the unused clerical skills and the males had the craft skills. The nonutilized operative skills were most often reported by females, and often involved sewing machines and textile equipment. Some of the nonutilized skills were occasionally employed in community service, but not in income-producing jobs. The data revealed that it was the younger workers who were most likely to have unused skills, probably due to the fact that they had been more broadly trained in their education than had the older generations and that they were more likely to take jobs that did not maximize their skills, in order to remain in rural areas. The older people in the sample often reported farming as an unused occupational skill. Unlike the even distribution of persons in terms of occupational categories reported earlier, the unused skills tend to be concentrated in only three occupational categories - clerical, crafts, and operatives.

Urban Occupational Patterns and the Impact on Traditional Rural Life

The diffusion and/or development of an urban occupational structure has not been without impact on traditional rural community life. Since the population base of the rural community is not large enough to provide a complete industrial exchange system, the shortage of workers has led

to an increase in the number of people with multiple occupations. As the technology of agriculture is improved the number of workers needed for farm work declines and there is a rapid decline in the total population of rural areas. Also, the change in occupational structure has increased the number of women engaged in income-producing work. The changing occupational structure in rural areas has meant that individuals must travel further to work, that many individuals have two or more jobs, that farming often becomes a secondary rather than primary occupational specialty, and that many useful occupational skills are unused or under-utilized. The values concerning rural life tend to have changed less but can they persevere in the face of a division of labor that often mirrors the urban context?

Epilog

Social and economic change has dramatically overtaken the rural context. In an earlier time, individuals stayed in the rural areas and farmed. Subsequently, they stayed in the rural areas in order to farm. Later they took up farming in order to be able to stay in the rural areas. A number of changes occurred to modify these patterns, however. Paved roads and highways facilitated commuting to, and commerce with, towns and cities. Television brought the urban culture to the rural dweller and often inculcated a desire for an urban-type material life style. Our wars took the young men from the rural areas and often gave them an alternate urban experience. The decentralization of trade and industry, however, made urban-type work available to the rural population. With plants and factories in many small towns and even in the open countryside, an industrial job was never more than commuting distance away. In the face of these events, people in rural areas remained in rural areas and often

both farmed and held down a job. Since the jobs not infrequently paid better, they came to hold down a primary job and farm as a sideline. Some persons moved from the small towns to the rural areas in order to indulge a nostalgia for their agrarian roots, and to be able to enjoy the rural ambience while maintaining an urban-type job and income. These were often "hobby" farmers or "gentlemen" farmers. Some persons of urban background simply longed for a more bucolic and even tempoed existence in a rural setting and took up residence there, often pursuing a craft of more creativity than many urban blue-collar (or even white-collar) jobs. All in all, the rural dweller of recent times has been attempting to enjoy the best of two worlds -- the space, privacy, less expensive cost of living, and relaxed life style of the rural setting with its opportunities for outdoor leisure activities and its more intimate social relations, while at the same time pursuing an urban-type job with its higher income, fringe benefits, and regularity of employment.

This double world existence has not been without its cost. Commuting itself, while a practical necessity, is expensive and time consuming. The new rural dweller apparently accepts the cost as a reasonable price to pay for the trade-off, and relishes what he receives in the bargain.

The new rural dweller can live in the country and have, in effect, a city job. He can farm on the side, if and as he pleases, or forego such agrarian pursuits, if he elects. The rural existence affords time (an eight-hour job is less time consuming than farming), and the urban level of living with the attendant amenities (modern homes, appliances, and automobiles) often requires an income level in excess of what one job can afford. With time and income need, the rural dweller (like his urban counterpart) turns to moonlighting. The second (or third) job

provides extra economic resources, challenge, and because of the nature of some secondary jobs, the individual may become better linked into a community trade and exchange network. The second job may well be the practice of a skill not represented in the community occupational repertoire, but a skill needed and sought. Thus, the individual, along with other similar individuals may well come to represent an interdependent economic and skill exchange system that mirrors on a part-time basis, the full-time, complex division of labor possible and present in the urban setting.

The rural context of today, then, is often less an agricultural setting than an area where the inhabitants live but commute to urban jobs in nearby towns, and where these inhabitants take up multiple jobs in order to enjoy an urban standard of living, as well as to create and maintain an urban-life economic and skill exchange network. In the process of accomplishing this, however, these individuals accomplish to retain a value system tied to and supportive of traditional rural attitudes, values, and priorities.

Multiple job holding is pervasive and extensive in its representation of occupational specialties and skill categories. Not surprisingly, craft pursuits are particularly prominent. Such pursuits readily lend themselves to part-time and sporatic work. They offer opportunity for creativity, and they derive from both traditional and contemporary sources. They can be relatively easily acquired, and can be easily interfaced with other work patterns. For a variety of reasons, including broader experiences, and a greater range of educational training, the younger generation often has a repertoire of skills and abilities that are either unused or under-utilized. This pool of underutilized skills represents a seminal set of resources for rural community development in the state and one which, if properly exploited, could both accelerate development and enhance the quality of life for rural inhabitants.

Rural dwellers in Virginia today often live in two worlds, and enjoy the advantages of both. This divided existence is not without cost and the economic and occupational "rat race" may well tend to dilute some of the benefits of rural life. For the present, however, traditional values linger and rural affinities persist. The new rural occupational structure has proved to be both utilitarian as well as flexible, and the latent skill resources inherent in this structure constitute a potent resource for future development. The rural citizen remains a durable fixture in the social enterprize, but is beginning to step a little livelier in the mainstream of American economic life.

REFERENCES

Bryant, Clifton D., C. Jack Dudley, and Donald J. Shoemaker (authors listed alphabetically)

1979 "Hustling, staying alive, and getting ahead: A study of multiple job holding and economic exchange systems in the rural south." Presented at the annual meetings of the Mid-South Sociological Association, Memphis, November.

1980 "Travel to work patterns among male and female rural residents." Presented at the annual meetings of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists, Hot Springs, Arkansas, February.

Clemente, Frank and Gene F. Summers

1975 "The journey to work of rural industrial employees." Social Forces 54(September):212-219.

Coughenour, C. M., and G. S. Kowalski

1977 "Status and role of fathers and sons on partnership farms." Rural Sociology 42(Summer):180-205.

Ellis, W. N.

1975 "New ruralism: the post industrial age is upon us." Futurist 9(August):202-204.

Gallup Opinion Index

1973 Job Satisfaction and Productivity. Report No. 94, April. Princeton, New Jersey: Gallup Opinion Index.

Guest, Avery M.

1975 "Journey to work, 1960-1970." Social Forces 54 (September): 220-225.

Guest, Avery M.

1976 "Occupation and the journey to work." Social Forces 55 (September):166-181.

Heffernan, W. D., and P. Lasley

1978 "Agricultural structure and interaction in the local community." Rural Sociology 43(Fall 1978):348-361.

1974 Job Satisfaction: Is There a Trend? Manpower Research Monograph No. 30. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Labor.

Kish, Leslie

1965 Survey Sampling. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

McKay, Roberta U.

1973 "Commuting patterns of inner-city residents." Monthly Labor Review 96(November):43-48.

Orden, D., et al.

1979 "An inventory and evaluation on cooperative extension programs in the South aimed at small and part-time farmers." Unpublished paper, Department of Agricultural Economics, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Reeder, Leo G.

1956 "Social differentials in mode of travel, time, and cost in the journey to work." American Sociological Review 21(February):56-63.

Sen, Lalita and Julian Benjamin

1979 Travel Behavior and Market Segmentation of Low and Middle-Income Residents of Richmond, Virginia. Volume 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation.

APPENDIX

RURAL MULTIPLE JOBS STUDY

I would like to begin by thanking you for participating in our study. The following questions will be easy to answer and will concern your feelings concerning the work that you do. Your answers will be held in the strictest of confidence and no report from this study will reveal you as a participant or report your answers in a form that will identify you. You may, of course, not answer any question that you do not wish to answer, and you may terminate the interview if you wish, at any time. We hope, of course, that you will answer each question as completely as possible. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Interviewer: Enter sex of respondent. _____

Enter race of respondent. _____

Our first questions concern your family:

1. How many people live in the house that you live in ? _____

2. How many of the people living in your house are not related to you? _____

3. How many of your children are living at home? _____

What are your children's ages and sex?

Child 1 age:_____; sex _____

Child 2 age:_____; sex _____

Child 3 age:_____; sex _____

Child 4 age:_____; sex _____

Child 5 age:_____; sex _____

4. Are you: married _____
single _____
divorced _____
separated _____
widowed _____

5. How many years have you been married? _____

6. How old are you? _____; Your spouse? _____

7. How long have you lived in this community? _____

8. How long have you lived in your present house? _____

9. How many years of education do you have? _____; Your spouse? _____

10. How many different towns have you lived in since you were 18 years old?
_____

11. Do you have plans for moving in the near future? _____

If so, is it to obtain a different job? _____

Do you plan to leave this community? _____ (probe)

As you know our major purpose is to study the patterns of work in rural areas. Please answer the following questions concerning your work.

12. Please tell us the number of full-time jobs that you have had since you were 18 years old: _____

13. What is your major occupation; that is, the occupation in which you make the most money?

_____Self employed? _____yes _____no

14. How many hours a week do you spend at this job? _____(average)

15. Considering everything, how satisfied are you with this job?

very satisfied _____

satisfied _____

neither too satisfied
nor too dissatisfied _____

dissatisfied _____

very disaatisfied _____

16. Do you consider this job to be an important part of your career, that is, is this the job that you would keep for the rest of your life?

Yes _____ No _____

17. Do any of the other people in your family (wife or children) have a job outside the home?

Yes _____ No _____

If so, what is their job and is it full or part-time?

Wife: _____ Full-time_____ Part-time_____

Child 1: _____ Full-time_____ Part-time_____

Child 2: _____ Full-time_____ Part-time_____

Child 3: _____ Full-time_____ Part-time_____

18. In addition to the job listed above, do you have other jobs (for which you receive some compensation in money or trade) that you perform on a full- or part-time basis? _____

If so, would you list the jobs and tell us how long you have held these jobs?

	How long?
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____
4. _____	_____

For each of the jobs listed, tell us why you took the job. (number responses)

Interviewer: If answer to question 18 is N/R, go to question 26.

19. Considering all the jobs you do, which is the most satisfying in terms of money?

_____

20. Considering all the jobs you do, which is the most satisfying in terms of enjoyment?

_____

21. Considering all the jobs you do, which is the most satisfying in terms of community prestige?

_____

22. Of the jobs you have, which do you consider the most important to you personally?

_____

23. Of the jobs you have, which do you consider the most important to your family?

_____

24. Are you self-employed in any of the jobs you have? Yes ____ No ____

Which ones? _____

_____

25. Have your reasons for having more than one job changed over time? (probe, i.e., did it start for money and change to enjoyment or a better life, etc.)

26. Please list any formal training you may have had for any of your jobs.

_____

_____

_____

_____

27. Do you have any skills (for which you have received formal training) that are not part of the jobs that we have discussed thus far?

Yes _____; No _____

If so, what are they?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

28. Do you regularly perform any work tasks for other people or groups in this community for which you receive no compensation?

Yes _____; No _____

If so, what are they?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

29. Our next question concerns how you get to work. For you and each member of your family, we need to know: 1) the distance you travel to work; 2) the mode of transportation (car, bus, etc.); and 3) whether or not there is a carpool or other effort to save transportation costs.

	location of job (Name of community)	Distance travelled (estimated)	Mode (car, public, walk, etc.)	Time
For yourself	_____	_____	_____	_____
Wife	_____	_____	_____	_____
Child 1	_____	_____	_____	_____
Child 2	_____	_____	_____	_____
Child 3	_____	_____	_____	_____

30. Would you say that any of your five best friends work where you do?

    1. all of them
    2. 4 of them
    3. 3 of them
    4. 2 of them
    5. 1 of them
    6. none of them

31. What is your major activity with your friends when you are not working?

    1. organized leisure (bowling leagues, softball, etc.)
    2. unorganized leisure (hunting, fishing, spectators, etc.)
    3. volunteer work (volunteer fire, hospital work, social or civic clubs)

32. If you could have any job that you wished, what would it be?

    _____

    Why would you want that particular job?